

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed 4 Nov 2003 of Examiner Akiba K. Roginson-Boyce.

Claims 1-6, 13-26, and 29 are pending in the application, none as yet allowed.

Drawings

Applicants submit herewith formal drawings (9 sheets) for entry to the case subject to the approval of the Examiner.

In these formal drawings, applicants have corrected element 434 of Figure 5 to correct the redundant word "OF" in the label as follows:

ADJUST MARKET ATTACK PLAN BASED UPON HEALTH OF [[OF]]
ENGAGEMENT FAMILY.

Applicants request that the formal drawings (with

Figure 5 corrected) be entered.

Election/Restriction

Restriction has been required to one of groups I (claims 1-6, 13-26, 28 and 29), II (claims 7-8 and 27) and III (claims 9-12 and 30). Applicants have elected group I without prejudice.

Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical and grammatical errors noted during review of the case in preparation of this amendment and response. As no new matter is involved, applicants request that the amendments to the specification be entered.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 13-15, 17, 26, 28, 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Guheen et

al.

Guheen et al. describes prioritizing components of a network framework required for implementation of technology.

Applicants have canceled claim 28.

Applicants have amended all remaining independent claims 1, 13, 26, and 29, to clarify that work product descriptions are specifically separated from process descriptions, and then related through the three phase process set forth in the claim. This added material is supported by applicants' specification at page 20, lines 3-20, page 25, lines 7-10 and page 51, lines 5-21.

Guheen et al. do not describe separating work product descriptions from process descriptions, and then relating them through the three phase process now recited in claims 1, 13, 26 and 29.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1, and claims 14, 15, and 17 depend from claim 13 and are similarly distinguished from Guheen et al.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3, 5, 6, 16, 20-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Guheen et al. in view of Bowman-Amuah.

Claims 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Guheen et al.

These claims all depend from the independent claims discussed above, and are distinguished from Guheen and the combination of Guheen et al. and Bowman-Amuah by the amendments which clarify that work product descriptions are specifically separated from process descriptions, and then related through the three phase process set forth in the parent claims.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-6, 13-26, and 29.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should

differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

S. D. Barnes, et al.

By


Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 30 Jan 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827

Phone: (607) 687-9913
Fax: (607) 687-7848